unty _C	Clinton	Route SR 28	Des. No1005600
CA	ATEGORICAL EXC	FHWA-Indiana Environmenta LUSION / ENVIRONN GENERAL PROJECT INFO	MENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM
Road	No./County:	State Route (SR) 28, AKA	Walnut Street, Clinton County
Desig	gnation Number (DES):	1005600 (lead), 1600437,	and 1600438
		1600438, and 1600437. The and County Road (CR) 2000 Hoke Avenue, a distance of	this CE has 3 DES numbers: 1005600 (lead) ne project begins at the intersection of SR 28 West, and proceeds east along SR 28 to f 2.38 miles.
¥ £		Road (CR) 200 West (west	ern terminus) east to Jackson Street (US
Proje	ct Description/Termini:	421/SR 39). DES 1600437 – reconstruc	tion of SR 28 from Jackson Street eastward t
s .		north bound (NB) Jackson	at turn land from west bound (WB) SR 28 to Street.
			e south side of SR 28, and replacing the
			of SR 28 with a shared used path. owing type of Categorical Exclusion (FHWA must
	approve if Level 4 CE):		
			eets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manu ies: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager)
			eets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manusies: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division)
X		evel 4 – The proposed action male Thresholds. Required Signatori	eets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manuels: ESM, ES, FHWA
	Environmental Assessme is necessary to determine the	nt (EA) – EAs require a separate he effects on the environment. R	FONSI. Additional research and documentation equired Signatories: ES, FHWA
	or documents prepared by or for Env o release for public involvement or s		eccessary for the ESM of the district in which the project is
,			
Appro	ESM Signature	Date ES Sig	nature Date
	Doin orginature	. Eb org	<i>Sub</i>
4			
	FH	WA Signature	Date
· ·		1111	-

Release for Public Involvement N/A RCB 8-8-19 ESM Initials Date ES Initials Date	E
	*
ESM Initials Date ES Initials Date	
Certification of Public Involvement Office of Public Involvement Date	
Note: Do not approve until after Section 106 public involvement and all other environmental requirements have been satisfie	d.
INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature: Date;	s **
Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: Richard Fitch, AICP and Mathew Aldridge, Burgess & Niple, Inc.	
Part I - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	* 0
Every Federal action requires some level of public involvement, providing for early and continuous opportunities throproject development process. The level of public involvement should be commensurate with the proposed action.	ughout the
Yes No	
Does the project have a historic bridge processed under the Historic Bridges PA*? If No, then:	
Opportunity for a Public Hearing Required?	
*A public hearing is required for all historic bridges processed under the Historic Bridges Programmatic Agreement betwee FHWA, SHPO, and the ACHP.	en INDOT,
Discuss what public involvement activities (legal notices, letters to affected property owners and residents (i.e. notice meetings, special purpose meetings, newspaper articles, etc.) have occurred for this project.	of entry),
Remarks: Notice of Entry	
No notice of entry letters were mailed to property owners near the project area. All investigations were conducted within the public right-of-way (ROW).	6.
Section 106 To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, FHWA's finding of adverse effect, a notice	
was advertised in <i>The Frankfort Times</i> on February 20, 2019. The public comment period closed 30 days	
later on March 22, 2019. The text of the public notice and the affidavit of publication appear in Appendix page D-38. No written comments were received during the public notice.	
The Section 106 process included a consulting party meeting on November 1, 2018 at the Frankfort City	
building. The meeting was attended by INDOT, FHWA, and the design consultant. Meeting invitations we sent to identified local consulting parties, but none attended the meeting. No written comments were received	re ed
from the meeting.	
Project Does Meet	
The project will meet the minimum requirements described in the current <i>Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Public Involvement Manual</i> which requires the project sponsor to offer the public	
an opportunity to submit comment and/or request a public hearing. Therefore, a legal notice will appear in local publication contingent upon the release of this document for public involvement. This document will be a public and the release of this document for public involvement.	a be
revised after the public involvement requirements are fulfilled.	
This is page 2 of 32 Project name: SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankfort Date: August 8,	2019

County	Clinton	Route SR 28		Des. No1005	5600
Public Con Will the proj	ntroversy on Environmental Grou ject involve substantial controversy	inds concerning community a	nd/or natural resource	and the second second	es No
Remarks:	No controversy At this time there is no substant resources.	ial public controversy con	ncerning impacts to the	ne community or	to natural
a c		<u> </u>			
Dowt	II - General Project Id	lantification Do	ecription an	d Design I	nformation
Part	<u>III - General Project ic</u>	ientinication, De	scription, an	u Design n	<u> </u>
	n n n		in	NDOT District: C	Provetoudovilla
	the Project: <u>INDOT</u> e of the Facility: SR 28 (AK	A Walnut Street)		IDO I Districtc	rawiordsvine
			ocal Other*		*5
*If other is s	selected, please indentify the funding	ng source:		·	. 2
PURPOSE	E AND NEED:				
Describe the	transportation problem that the pro	ject will address. The solu	ition to the traffic prob	olem should NOT	be discussed
in this section	n. (Refer to the CE Manual, Section	n IV.B.2. Purpose and Ne	ed)	2	·
Needs		* .			
Roadway P	Pavement Condition				
The existing	g pavement on SR 28 from west to Section 1 on the west end of the p	east consists of four difference from CR 200 W to	rent pavement types. Blinn Street is Hot I	Mix Asphalt (HM	A) over 9"
•	of concrete; Section 2 from Blinn Street to Pro-	airie Avenue is 9" concre	te;		_
•	Section 3 from Prairie Avenue to	Doyle Street is HMA over	er 9" of reinforced co	ncrete; and	
•	Section 4 from Doyle Street to Hobetween Jackson Street and Hoke	oke Avenue no pavement	information is availa	ble. It is believed	that
	asphalt surface indicates an uneven	en subbase. Several pave	ment core samples w	ere collected with	in Section 4
	between 2nd Street and Jackson S	treet identified the follow	ing:		
	• between 2 nd and 1 st Streets				
	 eastbound between 1st Stree eastbound between Main S 	Street and Columbia Street	t- 2" of asphalt on br	ick	
e	 westbound between Main 	Street and Columbia Stre	et- 6" of asphalt on 6	" of broken concre	ete .
	 westbound between Jackson 	on Street and Main Street	6" of asphalt on 6" l	oroken concrete.	
was to exter the lanes as portions of year usable (PCR) is 43 approximate	crete pavement was installed in 197 and the life of the pavement to 2019 well as along the travel direction a the concrete pavement are broken. service life. The most recent paver 3 out of 100, which is a poor rating tely 30% of the curbs damaged or marea to Hoke Avenue.	The concrete has severe and extensive patching. A Based on 1971 construction ment inspection was in 20 The curbs within the pro	ly deteriorated with p s seen in the paveme on, the concrete pave 12 and on average pa ject limits are in poor	navement cracking nt core samples in ement is at the end evement condition condition with	g both across n Section 4, I of the 50- n rating
1001dolldidi t					

SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankfort

This is page 3 of 32 Project name:

Date: August 8, 2019

County	Clinton		Route	SR 28		Des. No.	1005600
total of 19 SR 28 and turn lanes	93 crashes hav d Jackson Stre on all four les	s Report dated Janu e taken place withi et intersection with gs, but the right-tur e lane on each appi	n the project li a total of 31 c n and the throu	mits. The inters rashes. The Jac igh-lane are cor	ection with the ekson Street/SR nbined: The C	highest number 28 intersection lay Street/SR 28	has dedicated left intersection had
The sidev Most side further im and uneve do not hav projects w Core Wal	walk widths a upedes use by j en surfaces. Cu we curb ramps, vithin the City kway Districts	28 west of Column re narrow (less than nedestrians. East o	n five-feet wid f Columbia Steet withing the exist withing lished an ADA ADA complian phasizes ADA	e), don't drain preet, the sidewanthe City are no A Transition Plance. The SR 28	oroperly, and ha lks are in better t ADA complia in dated Februa s project is loca	we excessive cro shape but have ant, while many ry 29, 2018 that ted within two co	oss slopes which cracking, spalling, of the intersections requires all of the identified
subdistric INDOT d South 5 th with curbs	t office drivew riveway to Pra Street there is s but no should	is do not exist along yay is a four-lane di irie Avenue the fou a parking lane agai ders. East of Jackso on of SR 28 withou	vided roadway ur-lane section nst the south con Street the ro	y with paved sho has a paved me ourb. From S 5 th oadway is two l	oulders and ope dian and no she Street to Jackse	en ditch drainage oulders. From P on Street, the th	rairie Avenue to ree lanes narrow
Purpose The purpo improve s facilities.	ose of the proje afety at a high	ect is to provide a lo crash intersection,	ong-term solut and improve p	ion for the deter pedestrian and b	riorated conditi picycle infrastru	on of the SR 28 acture with ADA	pavement, a compliant
The logica with a cen	al termini for to ter median to	lependent Utility he project are SR 2 Hoke Avenue on th on another transpo	ne east that has	recently been r	t where the road éconstructed. T	dway transitions This project has	into four lanes independent utility
•						***	
PROJEC	T DESCRIP	ΓΙΟΝ (PREFERR	ED ALTERN	ATIVE):			
•			•		-t		
County:	Clinton	1.65 miles west of	Municip				
10	roposed Work		85 SE			18.7 Acree	. (a)
Total Work	c Length: _	2.38 Mile	(s)	Total Wo	ork Area	18.7 Acre	
Is an Intere	change Modifi en did the FHW	cation Study / Interd /A grant a condition	change Justific nal approval fo	ation Study (IM: r this project?	S/IJS) required	?	es¹ No X ate:
¹If an IMS o					t be submitted i	to the FHWA wit	th a request for final
This is	page 4 of 32	Project name:	SR 28 Paven	nent Reconstructi	on-Frankfort	D	Pate: August 8, 2019

County	Clinton	Route	SR 28	Des. No.	1005600	
0001111						

In the remarks box below, describe existing conditions, provide in detail the scope of work for the project, including the preferred alternative. Include a discussion of logical termini. Discuss any major issues for the project and how the project will improve safety or roadway deficiencies if these are issues.

Existing Conditions

SR 28 is the main east-west roadway through Frankfort that connects Interstate 65 (I-65) interchange west of town through the center business district and continues east along a combined SR 28/US 421 east of town. SR 28 within the project limits is locally named Walnut Street. SR 28 is an Urban Arterial through the project limits. The eastern half of the project limits from Jackson Street to Hoke Avenue, SR 28/East Walnut Street combines with US 421. Throughout the document the entire road length will be referred to as SR 28. The roadway cross-section varies in width through the project limits. Starting at the west end of the project, SR 28 is a four-lane divided or paved median cross section from CR 200 W to South 5th Street. Between South 5th Street and Columbia Street the road is three lanes wide with a two-way left turn lane (TWLTL) down the center and a wide shoulder on the east bound side for on-street parking. From Columbia Street to east of Jackson Street the three-lane cross section includes dedicated left turn lanes at each intersection. East of Jackson Street the cross-section narrows to two lanes to Hoke Avenue. At Hoke Avenue, east bound SR 28 has a dedicated right-turn lane.

DES 1005600 is the lead DES in this project. There are two other DES Nos. covered by this CE. DESs 1600437 and 1600438.

The Prairie Creek Bridge pavement overlay and riprap around the bridge piers (DES No. 1401678) will be included in the construction bid package. This proposed work is covered by a separate CE.

Preferred Alternative

The project determined the areas of pavement replacement or pavement overlay, intersection improvements, and pedestrian improvements through the project limits. The roadway configuration was to be 4-lanes from CR 200 S to 4th Street, 3-lanes from 4th Street to Clay Street, and 2-lanes from Clay Street to Hoke Avenue. A five-foot wide concrete sidewalk will be reconstructed along the southside of SR 28 from 900 feet west of West Street to Hoke Avenue. An eight-foot wide asphalt multi-use path will be constructed on the north side of SR 28 from CR 200 S to Hoke Avenue. The eight-foot wide multi-use path will replace the existing concrete sidewalk from Boomer Street to Hoke Avenue.

The preferred alternative based on the Engineer's Report and the Value Engineering Memo is as follows:

- Mill and overlay 1 ½" of hot mix asphalt (HMA) from CR 200 W to Blinn Street-DES 1005600
- Full depth replacement from Blinn Street to Jackson Street DES 1005600
- Full depth replacement from Hoke Avenue. DES 1600437

This is page 5 of 32 Project name:

- Dedicated left turn lanes will be added on SR 28 at Clay Street to allow for left turns at the intersection where they currently are not allowed. DES 1600437
- Right turn lane will be added on west approach leg of SR 28 at Jackson Street. DES 1600438
- Replace the existing curbs and gutters. DES 1005600 and DES 1600437
- Replace the existing stormwater sewer system with new mainline, collectors, and laterals. DES 1005600 and DES 1600437
- Extend the storm sewer east on Walnut Street beyond the end of the pavement replacement to Hoke Ave and north along Hoke Ave to the unnamed tributary.
- Remove and replace the existing sidewalk on the south side of SR 28 from 900 feet west of West Street to Hoke Avenue with a concrete sidewalk varying in width from five to six feet. DES 1005600 and DES 1600437
- Replace the existing sidewalk on the north side of SR 28 from Nickel Plate Road to Hoke Avenue with a six to eight-foot wide asphalt shared-use path. DES 1005600 and DES 1600437
- The shared use path will be concrete instead of hot mix asphalt in front of the First Christian Church of Frankfort and through the Christian Ridge Historic District. DES 1005600 and DES 1600437
- Extend the eight-foot wide asphalt shared-use path from Nickel Plate Road west to CR 200 W on the north side of SR 28. DES 1005600
- Provide ADA compliant curb ramps throughout the project limits. DES 1005600 and DES 1600437
- Provide a tree lawn between the sidewalk/shared use path and the curb varying in width from zero to six feet.

County	Clinton	Route	SR 28	Des. No.	1005600	

DES 1005600 and DES 1600437

- The project will require temporary right of way (ROW) from 36 parcels (0.370 Acre) and permanent ROW from 20 parcels (0.336 Acre). There will be no displacement of businesses or residences. DES 1005600 DES 1600437, and DES 1600438
- No permanent right-of-way will be acquired from any contributing properties within historic districts. DES 1005600, DES 1600437, and DES 1600438
- Any temporary right-of-way from contributing will be for yard grading or drive connections. No 4(f) use has been determined for Historic Properties. DES 1005600, DES 1600437, and DES 1600438
- The maintenance of traffic plan is to maintain one direction of traffic through the project limits during
 construction. Two-way traffic may be maintained west of the Nickel Plate Trail where a four lane cross section
 exists. DES 1005600, DES 1600437, and DES 1600438
- Access to driveways will be maintained during construction. DES 1005600, DES 1600437, and DES 1600438
- The new stormwater pipe outlets and riprap at Prairie Creek and the unnamed tributary to Prairie Creek the will require a waterway permit due to work below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of the creeks. The three wetlands at the west end of the project are exempt from permitting requirements. DES 1005600 and DES 1600437

The DES number after each bullet point indicates which project the improvement is associated with. The three DES numbers plus the overlay of Prairie Creek Bridge (DES 1401678) will be constructed under one construction contract.

The land use consists of a mix of industrial, commercial, residential, and institutional west of Clay Street. East of Clay Street to Hoke Avenue is residential.

The project will not impact any threatened or endangered species habitats. The project is adjacent to identified Historic Districts and contributing historic properties. The SHPO has determined that the project will have an *adverse effect* on the Christian Ridge Historic District due to moving the south curb line south of the current alignment, eliminating the street trees, and adding the 8' shared use path through the historic district. These impacts were unavoidable do to extension of the shared use path into the residential neighborhood requiring the relocation of the south curb line. There is no Section 4(f) use of historic properties.

The preferred alternative meets the purpose and need for the project by improving the condition of the roadway pavement, address the safety issue at west bound SR 28 at Jackson Street with the addition of the right turn lane, and improve pedestrian and bike accessibility through Frankfort.

The project plans (Appendix B, pages B-12) and project mapping and photographs (Appendix B, page B-2) are attached.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

This is page 6 of 32 Project name:

Describe all discarded alternatives, including the Do-Nothing Alternative and an explanation of why each discarded alternative was not selected.

Alternative 1 - Replace the existing pavement with full depth pavement. This alternative has the same configuration and improvements as identified in the Preferred Alternative with two exceptions:

- 1. The section of the project from Clay Street to Hoke Avenue would have a two way left turn lane added down the center of SR 28, and
- 2. The section of the project from CR 200 W to Blinn Street would have full depth pavement replacement.

While this alternative met the Purpose and Need of the project, the addition of the center turn lane would increase the amount of permanent ROW, impact properties that contribute to the Christian Ridge Historic District and increase the cost of the project. For these reasons, Alternative 1 was not selected.

Alternative 2 - Rubblize the existing concrete pavement from CR 200 W to Doyal Street, full depth replacement of

SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankfort	Date:	August 8, 2019

County	Clinton	Route _	SR 28	Des. No.	1005600
inches of I nine-inche due to the shared use	Hot Mix Asphalt (less would impact the rise in the payeme	et- This alternative would rubb HMA). Full depth replace wou e adjacent properties. Underdra ent height. The alternative would ay costs, engineering costs, and not selected.	ld be used in areas where the ins would be installed to pre ld include reconstructed of the	e increase in the went ponding be he sidewalk and	hind the sidewalk the addition of the
Street, pay This altern	vement would be re native didn't addre lress the navement	atch, mill and place a functional eplaced east of Doyal Street and ss the deteriorating condition of condition portion of the purpose e addition of the shared use pat	d in areas where a full overla f the subgrade and subgrade te and need of the project. Th	ly thickness could drainage issues. he project would	This alternative
It is severe spalling. I traffic. Do would not deteriorati increase to sidewalk a	ely deteriorated, we have a sphalt over brooming nothing would be able to keep in ing condition on are as 19,000 vehicles resulted.	The SR 28 pavement is appro- ith cracking with high severity, ick portions of the project are f d result in a rapidly deterioratin serviceable condition. This alt a Urban Arterial which currently per day by the design year. The d no improvements in ADA co- cted.	high extent patching, faulting alling structurally due to insign and disintegrating pavementarive would allow the pays serves nearly 17,000 vehics sidewalks would continue to	ng, corner breaks ufficient capacit int structure white vement to remai les per day and be degrade resulti	s, and joint y to carry SR 28 ch maintenance n in very poor and is anticipated to ng in more
				,	
			vesticable because (Morles	Il that apply).	
It would no It would no It would no	ot correct existing of ot correct existing of ot correct the existing ot correct existing of esult in serious imp	e is not feasible, prudent or properties and the safety hazards; and roadway geometric deficience deteriorated conditions and main acts to the motoring public and	cies; ntenance problems; or		X X
		To the second se			2 -
	<u>.</u>				
ROADW	AY CHARACTE	R: SR 28			
Current Al Design Ho	ll Classification: DT: our Volume (DHV): Speed (mph):	Urban Arterial 16,540 VPD (2016 7.59% Truck Percenta various Legal Speed (r	age (%) 2.3	18,990 V	PD (2039)
		Existing	Proposed		
Number o	fl apos:	Various-2 to 5 lanes	Various 2 to 5 lanes	*	
Type of La		Through, left turn, TWLTL	Through, left turn, TWLTL turn	, right	
Pavement Shoulder Median W	Width: /idth:	varies ft. N/A ft. varies ft. 3-5 ft.	varies ft. N/A ft. varies ft. 4-8 ft.		
Setting: Topograp		X Urban Suburb Level X Rolling	oan Rural		
This is	s page 7 of 32 Pi	roject name: SR 28 Paveme	nt Reconstruction-Frankfort		Date: _ August 8, 2019

		i e			
ESIGN CRITERIA FOR BR	IDGES: N/A	2 2		, .	
tructure/NBI Number(s):		Sufficiency Rating:			
			(Rating, Source	e of Information)	
	Existing	Proposed			
ridge Type:				*	·
umber of Spans: Veight Restrictions:	ton	ton			
eight Restrictions:	ft.	ft.		is .	
urb to Curb Width:	ft. ft.	ft.			
houlder Width:	ft.	ft.		*	
ength of Channel Work:		ft.			
,	other bridges or culverts within	the project limits.			
lill the structure be rehabilitate ne proposed action has multip	ed or replaced as part of the pro-	ect?	Yes 	No N/	
ne proposed action has multip 	ed or replaced as part of the pro le bridges or small structures, th	ect? nis section should be filled		X	
ne proposed action has multip 	ed or replaced as part of the pro	ect? nis section should be filled		cture.	
AINTENANCE OF TRAFF a temporary bridge proposed a temporary roadway proposed in the project involve the use Provisions will be made for a Provisions will be made to a fill the proposed MOT substantial	ed or replaced as part of the proble bridges or small structures, the bridges of small structures and the constitution of the problem in the bridges of small structures.	ect? nis section should be filled RUCTION: psure? (describe in remark sted: sses. vents or festivals. consequences of the actio	out for each struct	Yes N X X X X X X X	
AINTENANCE OF TRAFF a temporary bridge proposed a temporary roadway proposed ill the project involve the use Provisions will be made for a Provisions will be made to a Provisions will be made to a lill the proposed MOT substantial	ed or replaced as part of the proble bridges or small structures, the bridges or small structures, the bridges of small structures, the bridges of small structures, the bridges of a detour or require a ramp cloaccess by local traffic and so post-brough-traffic dependent busines of the bridges of the small special extrally change the environmental	ect? nis section should be filled RUCTION: psure? (describe in remark sted: sses. vents or festivals. consequences of the actio	out for each struct	Yes N X X X X X X X	No XX XX XX
AINTENANCE OF TRAFF a temporary bridge proposed a temporary roadway proposed ill the project involve the use Provisions will be made for a Provisions will be made to a vill the proposed MOT substantial the proposed MOT substantial the proposed MOT substantial the proposed mother than the propos	ed or replaced as part of the proble bridges or small structures, the bridges or small structures, the bridges of small structures, the bridges of small structures, the bridges of a detour or require a ramp cloaccess by local traffic and so post-brough-traffic dependent busines of the bridges of the small special extrally change the environmental	ect? nis section should be filled RUCTION: psure? (describe in remark sted: sses. vents or festivals. consequences of the actio	out for each struct	Yes N X X X X X X X	No XX XX XX
AINTENANCE OF TRAFF a temporary bridge proposed a temporary roadway proposed ill the project involve the use Provisions will be made for a Provisions will be made to a lill the proposed MOT substantial	ed or replaced as part of the proble bridges or small structures, the bridges or small structures, the bridges of small structures, the bridges of small structures, the bridges of a detour or require a ramp cloaccess by local traffic and so post-brough-traffic dependent busines of the bridges of the small special extrally change the environmental	ect? nis section should be filled RUCTION: psure? (describe in remark sted: sses. vents or festivals. consequences of the actio	out for each struct	Yes N X X X X X X X	No XX XX XX

County	Clinton	Route	SR 28	Des	s. No10	05600
Remarks:	The proposed phasing of the other half open to one-way to bound traffic will be detourseast end of the project betwee SR 28. The remaining resid detour route will be signed, and CR 200. The detour is 6. The closures/lane restriction buses and emergency service.	raffic. East bound for the full duen Young Streetents have driver. The west bound miles. s will pose a teres); however, no	nd traffic will be manation of the construct and Hoke Avenue ways off the cross reduction will utilize appropriate inconvenie or significant delays	untained during all uction. Local access where homes have bads or alleys behin Maish Road, Wash nee to traveling mo are anticipated, and	constructions will be ne driveways to the homes ington Avertorists (incluall inconve	and west eded at the ided directly to . A posted aue, US 421, ading school niences will
	cease upon project completicompletion.	on. Delays wou	ıld/may occur durin	g construction but v	vill cease wi	th project
		·				
ESTIMATI	ED PROJECT COST AND	SCHEDULE:			3	
Engineering	g: \$ 2,046,205 (2016-19)	Right-of-Way	y: \$ 750,000	(2020) Construct	ion: \$ 13,5	580,185 (2020)
	Start Date of Construction:	March 2020			ent cost estir	nates
	Ju	ly 2, 2019 and 119 (Amendmen		P.		
Is the proje	Yes tin an MPO Area?	No X				
If yes,						6
Name of	MPO N/A	×	- · ·		•	
Location o	f Project in TIP N/A					¥
Date of inc	corporation by reference into the	ne STIP <u>Jul</u>	y 25, 2019 (Amendn	nent) July 2, 2019 (2	20-24 STIP)	
RIGHT OF	WAY:					·
				Amount	(acres)	0.5
	Land Use Impacts		. Р	ermanent	-	nporary
Residential				0.031	. (0.123
Commercia		35.)		0.305		0.247
Agricultural				0.0		0.0
Forest				0.0	•	0.0
Wetlands			8 (5)	0.0		0.0
Other:				0.0		0.0
Other:			TOTAL	0.336		0.370
widths (exis	th Permanent and Temporary ting and proposed) should als and there impacts on the envi	o be discussed.	Any advance acqui	sition or reacquisitio	d Maximum nn, either kno	right-of-way own or

Date: August 8, 2019

SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankfort

This is page 9 of 32 Project name:

County	Clinton	Route SR 28	Des. No.	1005600	
Country		-			

Remarks:

All proposed temporary and permanent ROW will be partial parcel acquisition. No relocations or total property acquisitions are required. The permanent ROW being acquired are on corner lots to allow for the construction of ADA compliant curb ramps and the addition of right turn lane at Jackson Street. The temporary ROW is for tie ins to driveways and grading behind the sidewalk and the shared use path. There will be no permanent ROW from property listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or any property that is a contributing element to a Christian Ridge Historic District. The plans showing the locations of the acquired ROW is located in Appendix B, starting on page B-12.

<u>Part III – Identification and Evaluation of Impacts of the Proposed</u> <u>Action</u>

SECTION A - ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Streams, Rivers, Watercourses & Jurisdictional Ditches Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers State Natural, Scenic or Recreational Rivers Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana Navigable Waterways

Presence	· <u>Impa</u>	acts
	Yes	No
X	X	
	. —	
1. 1		

Remarks:

The Red Flag Investigation (RFI) dated 10/31/2017 prepared by B&N identified three (3) streams within a 0.5-mile radius of the project area. The RFI is located in Appendix E, page E-2. Two (2) of the streams, Prairie Creek and the unnamed tributary (UNT) to Prairie Creek (east end of the project area), are within the project area. Both of these streams will be impacted by the construction of stormwater discharge structures on the banks of the streams. The third stream is located along CR 200 North on the north side of SR 28 at the west end of the project. No impact is expected on this stream.

A Waters of the U.S. report was prepared by INDOT for Prairie Creek (dated 7/19/2017) as part of the separate bridge deck overlay project, covered under a separate CE. B&N prepared a separate Waters of the U.S. report for the remainder of the project area (dated 12/20/2017) which identified one (1) additional stream, an unnamed tributary (UNT) to Prairie Creek within the project area. The National Wetland Inventory Map reviewed as part of the B&N Waters of the U.S. report indicated a stream running north along the east side of CR 200 W at the west end of the project area. During the field investigation, this stream could not be located. The B&N Waters of the U.S. report is located in Appendix F, page F-2. The Prairie Creek Waters of the U.S. report is available from INDOT- Ecological and Waterway Permitting Section.

This CE project will impact Prairie Creek by the installation of the storm sewer outlets and riprap on the banks of the creek. The project will also impact the UNT to Prairie Creek with the discharge pipe and riprap from the storm sewer.

A summary of the two streams within the project area is below:

Stream Name	Lat/Long	OHWM Width (ft.)	OHWM Depth (in.)	Quality	Likely Water of the U.S.?
UNT to Prairie Creek	40.280266, -86.496506	10.6	13	Fair	Yes

-1:: 10 500	Duning to a second	SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankfort	Date:	August 8, 2019	
This is nage 10 of 32	Project name:	SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankton	Date.	August 6, 2017	

County

Clinton

Route

SR 28

Des. No.

1005600

40.2796 Prairie Creek -86.5095

22

20

Poor

Yes

Impacts to these streams are summarized below:

Stream Name	Lat/Long	Impact Length (l.f.)
UNT to Prairie Creek	40.280266, -86.496506	22.5
Prairie Creek*	40.2796 -86.5095	154.32

^{*}Includes impacts from both the roadway project and the bridge project (not covered by this CE).

The Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers; State Natural, Scenic, or Recreational Rivers; NRI; Outstanding Rivers for Indiana; and Navigable Waterways lists were reviewed by B&N. No listed waterways are within or adjacent to the proposed project area.

The permanent impacts to Prairie Creek are 134.56 linear feet (LF) of stream length and an additional 19.76 LF of temporary impacts for a causeway (work pad) to allow construction equipment access in the creek. The permanent and temporary impacts to Prairie Creek are 154.32 LF. The total Prairie Creek impacts represent both the impacts from the storm sewer discharges (part of this project) and the bridge improvements covered by a separate CE document. The permanent stream impacts to the UNT to Prairie Creek is 22.5 LF for the storm sewer discharge. Total permanent stream impacts to Prairie Creek and the UNT to Prairie Creek are 157.06 LF. Due to the stream impacts, stream mitigation credits will be purchased from an approved mitigation bank and/or in-lieu fee (ILF) credits. IDEM will make the final determination on the use of the ILF with their review of the 401 Water Quality Certification application.

Early Coordination letters (Appendix C, page C-2) were sent on 10/18/2016 to USFWS and IDNR with comments received from USFWS on 10/20/2016 and IDNR on 11/17/2016. USFWS stated they would not be providing a letter on the project due to the lack of impacts to significant natural resources and endangered species (Appendix C, page C-17). IDNR's response included the need for an IDNR construction in a floodway approval. IDNR listed measures that should be implemented to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources (Appendix C, page C-14). These measures include no work in the waterway from April 1-June 30, limit work in the streams, bank slopes, and prevent demo debris from entering the streams. The full wording for these recommendations are included in the Commitment Section of the CE.

Other Surface Waters

Reservoirs Lakes

Farm Ponds

Detention Basins

Storm Water Management Facilities

Other:

Presence

Impacts

Yes No X

Remarks:

The Red Flag Investigation (RFI) dated 10/31/2017 prepared by B&N identified five (5) lakes within a 0.5mile radius of the project area. The closest is approximately 0.1-mile south of the project area. No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated due to the distance of these waters and the use of best management practices (BMPs) during construction. No other jurisdictional surface waters were identified in the RFI within the project limits (Appendix E, page E-2).

County _	Clinton	F	Route	SR 28	Des. No1005600
,	The Water of the U. did not identify any	S. reports dated other surface wa	12/20/20 aters with	17 (Burge in the pro	gess & Niple) and 7/19/2017 (INDOT for Prairie Creek) roject area (Appendix F, page F-2).
	The project area is l City will be conduc Intent will be submi	ted through the f	inal desig	Frankfort	rt's MS4 boundary. Continued coordination with the project. Once the plans are approved, the Notice of
•					<u>Presence</u> <u>Impacts</u> Yes No
Wetlands		, sî - 11 s.	×		X
Total wetla	nd area: 0.27	acre(s)	· Total·	wetland a	area impacted: 0.1405 acre(s)
(If a determi	nation has not been n	nade for non-isol	ated/isola	ated wetla	ands, fill in the total wetland area impacted above.)
Wetland N	o. Classification	Total Size .	Imns	acted :	Comments
wenand in	o. Classification	(Acres)	. Ac		
. A	PEM	0.08	. 0.	04	Quality: Poor Isolated
В	PEM	0.03	0:0	005 .	Quality: Poor Isolated
C	PEM	0.10	. 0.	10	Quality: Poor Isolated
D	PEM	0.06	0.0	00	Quality: Poor Isolated
					FO AI Potes'
Wetland Det Wetland Deli USACE Isola	ineation ated Waters Determin	ation	<u>Do</u>	X X X	2/21/2018 2/21/2018 11/28/2018
Mitigation Pla	an			<u> </u>	
would resul Substan Substan Unique	t in (Mark all that app	ly and explain): o adjacent home ot costs; aintenance, or sa conomic, or envir	s, busine afety prol	ess or othe	ner improved properties; S, or
	9				
	7				
This is pa	age 12 of 32 Projec	t name: SR 2	8 Paveme	nt Recons	struction-Frankfort Date: August 8, 2019

This is page 12 of 32 Project name:

		Inc	liana Depai	rtment	of Transpo	rtation		
County _	Clinton		Route	SR 28		Des. N	lo	1005600
					li	the remarks how		
leasures ti emarks:	The Red Flag wetlands with indirect impa	te, and mitigate variation (Fair a 0.5-mile racets are anticipated (Ps) during cons	FI) dated 10/3 lius of the proje d due to the dis	1/2017 pre ect area bu	pared by B&N t none were wi	identified eleve thin the project	n (11) area.	No direct or
	of the U.S. re Approved Jur and D were n	port dated 7/19/2 isdictional Deter	2017 did not ide mination from Waters of the U	entify any the USAC J.S. becau	wetlands within E dated 11/28/ se they <i>are man</i>	n the vicinity of 2018 confirmed n-made features	Prairi that	et area. The Water e Creek. An Wetlands A, B, C, ructed in uplands
	As included in 0.1405 acre.	n the table above	e, Wetlands A, l	B, and C w	ill be impacted	I by the project.	Tota	l impact will be
E	1-3 (7)(B)(iv) presence in ro to other Wate	ded that the wetl Wetlands A, B adside ditches the rs of the U.S. Wexempt from state	, and C qualify nat do not exhib Vetland D is not	based on to t Clean V	heir low qualit /ater Act jurisc	y (Class I), sma lictional feature	ll size s or sı	(<0.5 acre), and arface connection
1	•				141	N.		
36					Presence	Impact	s	
e rrestrial nique or F	Habitat ligh Quality Hab	oitat			X	Yes X	No	·
e the rema emarks:	The primary has western end of western end of red fescue, ear	tify each type of a nabitat types are f the project area f the project area stern red cedar, a l by common ree	common grass a. There are app a. Per the Water autumn olive, E	lawns and proximatelers Report, English pla	grassy roadsid y 0.27 acres of the grass areas ntain, tall fescu	e embankments wetlands in roa are dominated b ae, and red clove	and n dside by sme	nedians on the ditches on the both brome grass,
	section of SR submitted to S required to cu restrictions in	y 38 trees will b 28 east of Jacks SHPO for comme t the trees. The U their early coord mber 30, Appen	on Street to Holents per the Sec JSFWS didn't i lination letter re	ke Avenue ction 106 N require tre esponse th	. The replacem Iemorandum o e cutting date r	ent tree planting f Agreement (M estrictions but D	g plan 1OU). DNR	No permits are did include
e e	The land that habitat fragme	will be impacted entation, nor will	will come fron wildlife crossi	n a strip o	ROW adjacentificantly affec	at to S.R. 28, as ted.	such,	there will be no
	landscaping o	lination with the r revegetation. E t nor species wit	arly coordination	on letters v	vith the IDNR	did not mention	or any	proposed on-site mique or high-
ere are higi nal movem	h incidences of ar ent, consideration	nimal movements of of utilizing wildlife	bserved in the pr crossings should	roject area, I be taken.	or if bridges and (other areas appea	er to be	the sole corridor for
	age 13 of 32	Project name:	CD 20 D	, t D	ruction-Frankfor	t	Da	te: August 8, 201

County _	Clinton Route SR 28 Des. No. 1005600
Karst Is the p Are kar	st features located within or adjacent to the footprint of the proposed project?
	proposed project located within or adjacent to the potential Karst Area of Indiana? If yes, will the project impact any of these karst features? Arks box to identify any karst features within the project area. (Karst investigation must comply with the Karst October 13, 1993) The project area is not located within or adjacent to the designated Karst region of Indiana as outlined in the MOU between INDOT, IDNR, IDEM, and USFWS (1993). An early coordination letter was sent to the Indiana Geological Survey, but no response was received. No other early coordination letter responses identified any karst issues within the project area. Appendix C, page C-2. No karst features were identified during the RFI (Appendix E, page E-2). Presence Impacts d or Endangered Species the known range of any federal species cal habitat identified within project area (based upon informal consultation) elecies found in project area (based upon consultation with IDNR) on 7 formal consultation required for this action? The Clinton County Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Species list from the RFI identified the project as being within the range of Clubshell (Pleurobema clava), Black-crowned Night-heron (Nycticorax nycticorax), and Indiana but (Myotis sodalis) (Appendix E, page E-15). In an early coordination response from IDNR dated 10/16/2016, they stated that "to date, no plant or animal species listed as state or federally threatened, endangered, or rare have been reported to occur in the project vicinity." (Appendix C, page C-14). USFWS did not give an early coordination response due to the "lack of impacts to significant natural resources and endangered species" (Appendix C, page C-17). The project falls under the 2013 U.S. Fish and Wildliffs Envice Interim Policy for the review of Highway Transportation Projects in Indiana (Interim Policy). All of the construction activities requirements are met by the project. This project qualifies for Range-wide Programmatic Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern long-eared Bat (M
Use the rema MOU, dated	October 13, 1993)
Remarks:	MOU between INDOT, IDNR, IDEM, and USFWS (1993).
	other early coordination letter responses identified any karst issues within the project area. Appendix C, page
	No karst features were identified during the RFI (Appendix E, page E-2).
Within th Any critic Federal s	I or Endangered Species e known range of any federal species al habitat identified within project area species found in project area (based upon informal consultation)
Is Section	
Remarks:	being within the range of Clubshell (<i>Pleurobema clava</i>), Black-crowned Night-heron (<i>Nycticorax</i>
	species listed as state or federally threatened, endangered, or rare have been reported to occur in the project
	resources and endangered species" (Appendix C, page C-17). The project falls under the 2013 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Interim Policy for the review of Highway Transportation Projects in Indiana (Interim
	Bat (NLEB), dated May 2016 (revised February 2018), Between FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration,
	Clinton County is within range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>) and the federally threatened northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>). In addition, an effect determination key was completed on 1/31/2019, and based on the responses provided, the project was found to "may affect, but
This is p	age 14 of 32 Project name: SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankfort Date: August 8, 2019

				- KI	1005600	
County	Clinton	Route	SR 28	Des. No.	1005600	

is not likely to adversely affect' Indiana Bat and NLEB (Appendix C, page C-33). INDOT reviewed and verified the effect finding and requested USFWS's review of the finding. No communication from INDOT to USFWS concerning their review and verification of the findings was found in the project file. No response was received from USFWS within the 14-day review period; therefore, it was concluded they concur with the findings. (Appendix C, page 19). Avoidance and Mitigation Measures (AMMs) are included as firm commitments in the Environmental Commitment section of this document.

This precludes the need for further consultation on this project as required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended. If new information on endangered species at the site becomes available, or if project plans are changed, USFWS will be contacted for consultation.

SECTION B - OTHER RESOURCES

Drinking Water Resources

Wellhead Protection Area Public Water System(s) Residential Well(s) Source Water Protection Area(s) Sole Source Aquifer (SSA)

If a SSA is present, answer the following:

Is the Project in the St. Joseph Aquifer System? Is the FHWA/EPA SSA MOU Applicable? Initial Groundwater Assessment Required? Detailed Groundwater Assessment Required?

Droconco	Imr	oacts
Presence	Yes	No
· X		X
X	X	٠.
X		X
	ii e	
Yes	No	18

Remarks:

Two specifically designated areas of underground water to be considered and protected include Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPAs) and Sole Source Aquifers (SSAs).

The project is located in *Clinton* County, which is not located within the area of the St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer, the only legally designated sole source aquifer in the state of Indiana. Therefore, the FHWA/EPA Sole Source Aquifer Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is not applicable to this project. No impacts are expected.

The Indiana Department of Environmental Management's Wellhead Proximity Determinator website (http://idemmaps.idem.in.gov/whpa/) was accessed on 10/19/2016 by B&N. Based on the project location it was determined that this project is located within a Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA). The section of SR 28 between Lewis Smith Road and S. 5th Street is within a Wellhead Protect Area. In the early coordination response letter dated 10/19/016, that is auto-generated, IDEM did not identify the project area within a WHPA, (Appendix C, page C-6). IDEM Drinking Water Section-Ground Water Section was contacted on 5/15/2019 and identified the Wellhead Protection Area is associated with the public water system for the City of Frankfort. IDEM had no comment on the project. The Frankfort Water Works was contacted by email on 5/20/2019 to coordinate the project. The City of Frankfort responded on 5/21/2019 concerning requirements for the portion of the project between Lewis Smith Road and S. 5th Street within the WHPA. Frankfort will require the following firm commitments of Best Management Practices (BMP) to protect the WHPA.

- Provide secondary containment for hazardous materials stored within the project area;
- Per 327 IAC 2-6.1-5(2), follow spill reporting and clean-up requirements;
- If post-construction water quality treatment will be incorporated into the project, the City's treatment standard is 80% TSS. Infiltration treatment practices are not allowed within the

s is page 15 of 32	Project name:	SR 28 Pavement Reconstruction-Frankfort	Date:	August 8, 2019	

	Clinton	Route	SR 28	Des. No.	1005600
	wellhead	protection area; and		2	
		asks that new stormwater	er inlet castings be p	precast with a pollution	prevention message
	such as "	No dumping. Drains to S	Stream".		
	Copy of the email fr	om the City of Frankfort	is in Appendix C, p	page C-40.	
	page B-3), this projection 2/7/2017, to France	review, a site visit on 1/2 cct is located where there kfort Water Works. No ruring utility coordination	is a public water sy esponse was receive	stem. An early coordin	ation letter was sent
	The Tudiene Descrip	ant of Natival Dagayyas	Motor Well Deco	rd Database website	
	(https://www.in.gov	nent of Natural Resource <u>/dnr/water/3595.htm</u>) wa	s water well kecol	2019 by B&N Several	wells are located at
	the western end of the	ne project. These wells ra	inge from 40' to ove	er 500' from the SR 28 J	ROW. The wells will
	not be affected becar	use no ROW will be requ	ired from the prope	rties were wells are loc	ated. Therefore, no
	impacts are expected	I. Should it be determine	ed during the right-c	f-way phase that these	wells are affected, a
		ly be included in the app			
	•	•	3 5	e	
			Pres	sence Impa	
ood Plain		¥ .		Yes	No
	inal Encroachment se Encroachment			X	
	ocated within a regulat	ed floodplain		X	
Homes Id	ocated in floodplain wit	hin 1000' up/downstream		X	X
					·
	cts according to classi	fication system described	I in the "Procedural	Manual for Preparing Er	<u> Nironmentai Studies .</u> Eleadulain
marks:	The project is locate	d within one (1) Federal . Creek. Portions of the pr	Emergency Manage	ment Agency (FEIVIA).	e Regulatory
	Elocdrony The proje	creek. Portions of the process work includes the stor	m sexver outlet stru	ctures on the banks of P	ráirie Creek.
	· ·	or work morados mo sio.			
	Comments were rece	eived during the Early Co	ordination Letters f	rom Indiana Departmen	t of Environmental
	Management (IDEM) identifying the need for	r an IDNR Floodpla	in Permit if within the c	ne-hundred year
	floodway of a given	water body. The respons	e from Indiana Dep	artment of Natural Reso	urces (IDNR) also
		or construction in a flood		No local Floodplain Co	ordinator was
	identified for the Cit	y of Frankfort or Clinton	County.		
	The project will fall:	under Category 4 of the I	NIDOT Categorical	Exclusion Manual (0)	nomes are located
	within the base flood	plain within 1000 feet up	stream and four (4)	homes are located with	in the base
	floodplain within 100	00 feet downstream. The	proposed structure	will have an effective ca	apacity such that
	backwater surface ele	evations are not expected	l to substantially inc	rease. As a result, there	will be no
	substantial adverse in	npacts on natural and bei	neficial floodplain v	alues; there will be no s	ubstantial change in
-	flood risks; and there	will be no substantial in	crease in potential f	or interruption or termin	nation of emergency
ľ	service or emergency	evacuation routes; there	tore, it has been det	ermined that this encros	he completed during
	substantial. A hydrau	lic design study that add n phase. A summary of t	resses various struct	duded with the Field Cl	peck Plans
	the preliminary design	n phase. A summary of t	me grady will be me	videa Mini me Lieid Ci	iook I iaiis.
	Floodplain maps are	located in Appendix F, p	age F-21.		
Į					
		*	Presence	. Impacts	
rmland			1.0001100	Yes No	0
Agricultur	al Lands	¥			
	rmland (per NRCS)				
Prime Fai					
	ts (from Section VII of	CDA 106/AD 1006*	N/A		